

**REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 6 and 8 and leaves claims 2-5 and 7 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-8.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone so as to schedule an interview to discuss the outstanding issues of the present application prior to examination based on the present Amendment. It appears from the Office Action that the Examiner misunderstands the invention and the prior art and such misunderstanding needs to be corrected.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Kleewein (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,017) and rejected claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleewein in view of Lu (article entitled "Dynamic and Load Balanced Task-Oriented Database Query Processing in Parallel Systems"). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as recited in claims 1-8 are not taught or suggested by Kleewein or Lu whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

As argued in the Remarks of the September 26, 2003 Amendment, the features of the present invention as recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Kleewein or Lu whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. The Remarks of the September 26, 2003 Amendment are incorporated herein by reference.

The present invention is directed to a database processing method used in a database system 101 arranged in a client-server manner such as that illustrated in Fig. 1 of the present application. According to the present invention a first process is implemented wherein a database server 102, 121 operating in response to a request of a program 112 operating at the client 111, to process large object (LOB) data on a database 144 stored the processed LOB data to a common storage device 151 which is shared through a network 103 between the client 111 and the server 102, and common storage device being a storage device other than a storage device 141 to which the database 144 is stored, and transmits an identifying information 165 which identifies a storage area of the data processed and stored on the common storage device 151 to the program 112. Further, according to the present invention as second process is implemented wherein the program 112 operating at the client 111 refers to the storage area 152 of the common storage device 151 for the LOB data based on the identifying information 165 including a result of the data processed, and obtains the stored data from the storage area 152 into the program 112.

By implementing the above described features of the present invention as described above and as illustrated in Fig. 1 of the present application the present invention achieves an object of providing a technique of overcoming various disadvantages (1) through (3) as described on pages 3 and 4 of the present application, thereby speeding up the process of passing data from a database server 102 to a user application in a database system 101. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 4, line 26 through page 5, line 14 of the present application. A further object of the present invention is providing a technique for simplifying a

description of source codes used for treating data to be managed by the database in a user application and speeding up the passing of plural data units between a database server and a user application in a database system.

The above described features of the present invention and the objects accomplished by the present invention are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Kleewein and Lu whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

In the Office Action it appears that the Examiner completely ignores the specific features recited in the claims. For example, the Examiner has not shown with any satisfaction where a teaching can be found in the references of record of a common storage device and the second process of the present invention. The second process enables the program operating at the client to refer to the storage area of the common storage device for the LOB data and to obtain the stored data from the storage area of the common storage device. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Kleewein of the above described features of the present invention.

Kleewein merely teaches that the LOB data from the inner table is directly transferred to an application program 19 enabling the application program 19 to process the query response data using the actual LOB data. The Examiner's attention is directed to col. 6, lines 1-8 of Kleewein. This teaching of Kleewein is entirely different from the features of the present invention as recited in the claims being that the present invention specifically recites that a common storage device is provided as being connected to a network 103 connected between the client 111 and the server 102, wherein the common storage device is shared (accessible) by the

client 111 and the server 102. There is no such teaching in Kleewein or Lu of a common storage device being shared through a network between the client and the server as in the present invention.

In the Office Action the Examiner alleges that memory 24 taught by Kleewein in Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 10-13 thereof corresponds to the common storage device. However, the memory 24 taught by Kleewein is simply a memory included within the server 14 and as such is connected to a bus which forms a part of the internal structure of the server 14. Further, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Kleewein that the memory 24 is accessible by both the server 14 and any one of the clients 10 and 12. In fact, as illustrated in Fig. 1 of Kleewein each client 10 and 12 is not connected to a separate bus to which both the client 10, 12, the server 14 and the memory 24 is connected. As clearly illustrated in Fig. 1 of Kleewein each client 10, 12 is connected to an input/output module 16 which enables communications between the clients 10 and 12 and the server 14.

Even further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kleewein wherein the clients 10 and 12 are allowed to directly access the contents of the memory 24 as in the present invention.

Therefore, Kleewien fails to teach or suggest a first process of enabling a database server operating at a server to store LOB data processed on a database from the database, in response to a request of a program operating at a client, to a common storage device which is shared through a network between the client and the server said common storage device be storage other than a storage device to which the database is stored as recited in the claims.

Further, Kleewein fails to teach or suggest a second process of enabling the program operating at the client to refer to the storage area of the common storage device for the LOB data based on the identifying information to obtain the stored data from the storage area into the program as recited in the claims.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kleewein of the transfer of identifying information from the server to the client as in the present invention. According to the present invention the identifying information identifies a storage area of the data processed and stored on the common storage device. As described above, the common device is a separate storage which is connected to the network which also connects the client and the server. This configuration as clearly recited in the claims is such as that illustrated in Fig. 1 of the present application wherein the client 111, the server 102 and the common storage device 151 are each connected to the network 103. Further, as illustrated in Fig. 1 the server 102 transmits 165 the identifying information to the client so as to identify the storage area 152 of the common storage device 151 at which the processed LOB data is stored. Such teaching is clearly not provided by Kleewein.

Therefore, Kleewein fails to teach or suggest transmitting an identifying information which identifies a storage area of the data processed and stored on the common storage device to the program as recited in the claims.

Further, Kleewein fails to teach or suggest a second process of enabling the program operating at the client to refer to the storage area of the common storage device for the large object device based on the identifying information as recited in the claims.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Kleewein. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-8 as being anticipated by Kleewein is respectfully requested.

The above noted deficiencies of Kleewein are not supplied by Lu. Therefore, combining the teachings of Kleewein and Lu in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Lu is simply relied upon by the Examiner for an alleged teaching of enabling plural processes. However, Lu does not supply any of the above noted deficiencies of Kleewein with respect to the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Particularly, Lu does not teach or suggest the above described features regarding the common storage device, the second process and the transmitting of identifying information.

Thus, combining the teachings of Kleewein and Lu in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 4 as being unpatentable over Kleewein in view of Lu is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-8.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500:37238CX1).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 312-6600